DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 910 LI 003 416

AUTHOR	Lubetzky, Seymour
TITLE	Descriptive Cataloging: Problems and Principles; Report 3 of a Series on the Principles of Cataloging.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. Inst. of Library Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	OE-4284
PUB DATE	1 Apr 69
GRANT	OEG-1-7-071089-4284
NOTE	58p.; (56 References)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Cataloging; *Information Processing; *Information Retrieval; *Information Storage; Library Materials; *Library Technical Processes

ABSTRACT

This report presents an analysis of the problem of descriptive cataloging as a whole: the aspects of the problem, the questions they raise, the issues involved, the course adopted in the new "Anglo-American Cataloging Rules," and the principles that would serve best the objectives of the catalog. (Author)

ED 058910

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGING:

PROBLEMS and PRINCIPLES

Seymour Lubetzky

Report 3 of a series on

The Principles of Cataloging

OE-4284

1 April 1969

Institute of Library Research
University of California
Los Angeles

LI 003 416

ABSTRACT

This report presents an analysis of the problem of descriptive cataloging as a whole: the aspects of the problem, the questions they raise, the issues involved, the course adopted in the new Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, and the principles that would serve best the objectives of the catalog.

Acknowledgement is made of the assistance of Mrs. Nancy Brault, Research Assistant of the Institute of Library Research, University of California.

DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGING:

PROBLEMS and PRINCIPLES

The questions arising in the process of cataloging a seemingly unending variety of library materials are many and have caused a continuous proliferation of rules in Anglo-American cataloging. This growth, which began with Panizzi's famous ninety-one Rules published in 1841[1], decried at the time as too numerous and complex, continued through the four editions of Cutter's Rules published between 1876 and 1904[2], the Catalog Rules of 1908[3] which replaced them, and culminated in the A.L.A. Catalog Rules of 1941[4], fortuitously the centenary of Panizzi's Rules. The complexity and inconsistencies which characterized the 1941 rules now threatened the economy of cataloging and the effectiveness of the catalog, and evoked the cry of "Crisis in Cataloging"[5] and a call for a "pragmatic" reevaluation and revision of the accumulated rules. The response to this call began with a cautious examination and then revision of the rules of "Description,"[6] the simpler aspect of cataloging, and the success of this work subsequently led to a similar investigation and revision of the rules of "Entry,"[7] the critical and complex aspect of cataloging. The result of this revision, which was completed and officially presented to the American Library Association and the Library of Congress in 1966--exactly a quarter century after the appearance of the A.L.A. Catalog Rules of 1941 which sparked the revision--was published early in 1967 as the new Anglo-American Cataloging Rules.[8]

What is most significant about the character of the revision--of the

rules of "Entry" as well as the rules of "Description"--and distinguishes best the new Anglo-American code from the former cataloging rules, is the systematic approach to the problem of cataloging. Beginning with the axiom that a catalog must be designed to serve certain purposes related to the operations and services of the library, and that the rules must be designed to produce such a catalog, the revision set out first to determine these purposes and the questions they raised. An examination of the library's operations and services on the one hand, and of the library's most typical resource--the book--on the other, led to the conclusion that an effective catalog must serve

> First, to facilitate the location of a particular book, or item, which the library has, and
>
> Second, to reveal to the catalog user what other editions, translations, or representations the library has of the work, and what works it has of the author.[9]

These were then adopted as the basic objectives of the catalog, and these objectives were later confirmed also by the International Conference of Paris.[10]

Use and Function of Main Entry. Proceeding from these objectives to the problem of cataloging, it will soon be noted that the first objective alone--to facilitate the location of a particular book in the library--will often require more than one entry for a given book, because some people may be familiar with the author, or may be directed by a citation to the author, and will therefore look for the book under the author's name, while others may be uncertain of the author's name or its spelling, or may remember best the title of the book, and look for it under its title. Still others may be interested in the book because of its editor, translator, or illustrator and look for it under their names. If the interests and needs of all or

most of the users are to be served, obviously multiple entries will often have to be made for a given book--under its author, title, editor, translator, or illustrator. Thus the first methodological question arises. Should the multiple entries be formed by permuting the elements of the entry--as author-title-illustrator, title-author-illustrator, illustrator-author-title? Or should only one entry be made--a "main entry"--which would include all the necessary data about the book or source, with references from the other elements under which the item may be sought to direct the reader to the main entry? Or, still, should one basic or unit entry be made in multiple copies which might then be supplied with the necessary headings to form all the desirable entries? All these methods, and some combinations, may be found and have been considered.

The first method--permuting the elements of the entry--characterizes the primitive catalog whose objective was limited to the location of individual books in the library. It may still be found in informally constructed catalogs and indexes likewise concerned only with the location of individual books. The following entries from British Books in Print, 1968, subtitled "the reference catalogue of current literature," illustrate this method:

Linden, R. O. Books and Libraries

Books and Libraries (Linden)

Libraries, Books and (Linden)

Obviously this method will serve only the first but not the second objective set forth before.

The second method--using one full main entry and as many and as brief references to it as may be deemed necessary and sufficient--may be described as the classical style typified by the British Museum catalog. The following entries from this catalog (Photolithographic Edition, 1959-1966)

illustrate this method:

**The Big Books. See Strang (Herbert) pseud.

**Strang (Herbert) pseud. [i.e., George Herbert Ely and C. J. L'Estrange.] The Big Books. Edited by H. Strang. Humphrey Milford: London [1923--]

* *
*

**Boulle (Pierre) The Bridge on the River Kwai.
See infra: Le Pont de la rivière Kwai.

**[Le Pont de la rivière Kwai.] The Bridge on the River Kwai. Translated . . . by Xan Fielding. [A novel] pp. 170. Seiker & Warburg: London, 1954.

**Fielding (Xan)

. . . . . .

--See Boulle (P.) [Le Pont de la rivière Kwai.] The Bridge on the River Kwai. Translated . . . by X. Fielding. 1954.

This method has two important advantages--one economic and the other functional. The use of references in lieu of additional entries, as will be noted particularly from the first example, makes possible an economy of space--an important consideration in itself in a large, bulky, and fast growing printed catalog--as well as an economy in the cost of production of the catalog. At the same time, the use of one main entry, as illustrated by the second entry under Boulle (Pierre) makes it possible to design it in such a way as to bring together, in one place in the catalog, all the editions and translations of a work and all the works of an author--which is the second objective of the catalog. The reader consulting this catalog for Boulle's Bridge on the River Kwai is directed to look under the

original title, where he will find listed together all the editions and translations which the library may have of that work, as well as the other works of that author--although this has not been carried out in the British Museum catalog without qualifications. The main entry is thus designed not merely as the representation of a particular book as such, but as the representation of a book as an edition of a particular work by a particular author--thus forming a bibliographical nucleus of a systematically constructed catalog.

The third method--using one basic or unit entry in multiple copies supplied with the necessary headings to form all the desired entries--characterizes the modern card catalog generally found in American libraries. Here the use of brief references would seldom reduce the number of cards required and consequently would not affect the bulk of the catalog, and the cost of providing a special reference would generally be higher than that of adding a desired heading to one of the copies of the basic or unit entry, which is normally mechanically reproduced or purchased in multiple copies. Thus considerations of economy favored the use of added entries, in place of the references used in the printed book catalog, whenever this could be done. Furthermore, it was also widely felt that the use of added entries would be more helpful to the catalog user, because he would then find what he was looking for where he looked for it first--say, under the title of the book--instead of finding a reference to look for it elsewhere. But this view ignored the fact that the basic purpose of the reference was not merely to help one find the book--or source--he was looking for, but to help him find it in the context of the other editions and translations of the work and of the other works of the author which the library had, while the added entry was calculated to stop and divert him short of his goal.

It should be noted, however, that the third method evolved not as one

basically different from the second method, but rather as a technological modification of it--continuing the use of a main entry, but using the main entry also as the unit entry to form added entries in lieu of the references of the second method wherever possible. Inasmuch as the classical function of the main entry--or "the entry"--had never been clearly set forth and generally understood, its use as the unit entry came to be regarded progressively as its principal function, and the idea of the "main" entry as such, together with the complex rules developed to determine how it is to be chosen in a variety of circumstances, came to be regarded increasingly as a technological anachronism. This notion gained considerable interest and impetus with the introduction of automation in cataloging when some maintained that, if the idea of a "main" entry were recognized as obsolete and abandoned, only a basic description of an item with the necessary headings would need to be provided, from which all the desirable entries might then automatically be produced by an appropriate computer program. Of course, if the main entry were really unnecessary for any other purpose, the process of cataloging could substantially be simplified, whether automated or not. But the critics of the main entry were apparently oblivious of the objectives which the main entry was originally intended to serve and which were the subject of three working papers at the International Conference of Paris.[11]

Principle of Authorship. The use of a main entry to represent a publication not as a distinct entity but as an edition of a particular work by a particular author, and so as to relate it to the other editions and translations of the work and to the other works of the author, requires that the main entry should be under the author's name, followed by a title chosen to designate the work (as discussed later) and a description of the publication

itself containing the work (also discussed later) as illustrated by the main entry under Boulle (Pierre) above. It should be noted that this form of main entry will cause the works of an author and the editions and translations of a work to appear together in the catalog not only under their main entries, but also under their added entries--for editors, translators, subjects, etc.--when these are based on the main entry as the unit entry. Hence the first and basic rule in the original Anglo-American Catalog Rules of 1908, and in all subsequent editions since--with minor variations in wording--has been "Enter a work under the name of its author," meaning that the main entry should be under the author of the work. Since this "principle of authorship" was to be of cardinal importance in cataloging, the need of a definition of the concept of authorship was recognized, and the definition provided in the 1908 rules stated that the "author" was:

> "1. The writer of a book, as distinguished from translator, editor, etc.
>
> 2. In a broader sense, the maker of the book or the person or body immediately responsible for its existence . . ."[12]

The first part of the definition was understandable; but the second part, requiring a determination of "the person or body immediately responsible for [the book's] existence" often confronted the cataloger with a dilemma and gave rise to considerable controversy and growing confusion. Given a book such as a posthumous edition of the letters of a person painstakingly collected by a friend and prepared by him for publication with an informative introduction--who was to be regarded as "immediately responsible for [that book's] existence"? The writer of the letters, or the friend who brought that collection into being? Or take a bibliography compiled by a library staff member, at the direction of an officer of the library, and as part of that member's duties in the library--or, in general, a work produced

by one engaged and paid to do it--who was to be regarded as "immediately responsible for [that work's] existence"? The more one contended with this definition--which despite its ambiguity remained intact through the 1949 edition of the rules--the more it appeared complex, indeterminable, and irrelevant! To remedy the situation, the 1949 edition added, after the first "General rule" prescribing that the main entry of a work is to be "under the name of its author," the following important elucidation:

> "The author is considered to be the person or body chiefly responsible for the intellectual content of the book, literary, artistic or musical."[13]

The explanation was undoubtedly well intended. It was apparently meant to imply that the author is really not the person responsible for the existence of the "book"--for which the editor or publisher might often be regarded as "immediately responsible"--but the person responsible for the intellectual product which forms the content of the book; that is, the author is the person responsible for the work contained in the book. But the phrase "intellectual content," though intriguing, conveyed an ambiguous and quite elusive meaning, and thus failed to clarify substantially the concept of authorship. Reaching further for a clarification, the new Anglo-American code of 1967 combined and refined the previous definition and elucidation to read:

> "Author. The person or corporate body chiefly responsible for the creation of the intellectual or artistic content of the work, e.g., the writer of a book, the compiler of a bibliography, the composer of a musical work, the artist who paints a picture, the photographer who takes a photograph."[14]

On analysis, however, there is little improvement to be found in this version. It is difficult to see any significant advantage in the phrase

"intellectual or artistic content" over the previous "intellectual content," both equally ambiguous; or in the phrase "responsible for the creation of the . . . content" over the previous "responsible for the . . . content," both equally difficult to determine. What is more, the phrase "intellectual or artistic content of the work" suggests a meaning like "the intellectual substance, or the ideas, of the work." Does it mean, then, that the author is to be considered to be the person responsible for the ideas embodied in the work? The thought is not without interest or value and, indeed, may be traced in some of the former rules--such as those prescribing that epitomes, adaptations, and similar works should generally be entered under the name of the original author; but is it a plausible objective of practical day-to-day cataloging? Considering the examples illustrating the definition, a much simpler notion of authorship appears to have been intended. "The writer of a book, the compiler of a bibliography, the composer of a musical work, the artist who paints a picture, the photographer who takes a photograph"--all these suggest that the author is simply the person who produces a work, whatever the character of the work, whether or not it has any "intellectual or artistic content," and whoever may actually be "chiefly responsible for the creation" of that content.

The hiatus between the definition and the examples are bound to continue the ambiguity of the concept of authorship and the difficulties and inconsistencies that have characterized the determination of the main entry in Anglo-American cataloging. There is an obvious need of a more practical and realistic definition. Before attempting one, however, it is important to diagnose the difficulties of the present and the previous definitions.

These may be traced to two sources. The first, which has been a primary cause of confusion in Anglo-American cataloging and unfortunately has not been completely removed from the new rules, is, as already noted,

the failure to distinguish clearly between the book and the work contained in it, and to follow through with the implications of this distinction. Had this distinction been recognized and carried out in the 1908 rules, and the word "work" properly and meaningfully used in the definition of "Author" instead of the word "book" actually used in it,--i.e.:

> "In a broader sense, the maker of the work or the person or body immediately responsible for its existence"--

a good deal of the tortuous course of the definition and of the confusion which it entailed would undoubtedly have been avoided. It would have been understood from the outset that, in determining the author, one is concerned not with the person who produced the book or edition in hand, but with the person who produced the work contained in it, which may be found in various editions and translations. Thus in returning to the collection of letters mentioned before, one would be concerned in determining the author or the main entry, not with who produced the collection in hand, but with who produced the letters which are contained in the collection and which may also be found in other editions and translations.

The second source of trouble has been the word "responsible" used in the definition of authorship. Recalling the bibliography mentioned before, who is to be regarded as "chiefly responsible" for it: the bibliographer who compiled it or the institution which caused him to do so? The course adopted in such circumstances involved considerations such as caused Hanson to brood: "Why bother our heads about such a trifling matter as whether Mr. Childs did a given piece of bibliographic work on his own time and at his own expense, and accordingly to be entered under his name; or on government time and at government expense, and therefore to be entered under the institution which pays him a salary"?[15] Similar problems arise in the case of a report prepared by one engaged to do it but issued in the name of

another person or of a corporate body, a speech written by one but delivered by another in his own name, the "autobiography" of a person actually written for him by another person, and so on. In all these and similar cases, who is to be regarded as "chiefly responsible": the one who actually created the work or the one in whose name it was issued? The existing definition, expressing the temper of the cataloger, implies that the person who is actually "responsible for the creation" of a work should be regarded as the author; but to do so in such cases would be flying in the face of overwhelming reality, and special rules had to be provided to countermand the definition in such circumstances. This, however, points up a very important fact of life that must be recognized in cataloging and must qualify the definition of authorship. This fact was, interestingly, best explained by Winston Churchill who reportedly once brought a draft to King George VI for use as a Speech from the Throne. When the King reflected wistfully upon his delivery of a prime-ministrial statement as a Speech from the Throne, Churchill is said to have replied sensitively: "Your Majesty, everyone can write a check, but only the one who signs it can validate it." In cataloging, too, it must be recognized that it is really not "the writer of a book" or the creator of a work who will generally be regarded as the author, or the one "chiefly responsible" for it, but the one who lent his name and authority to it--the one <u>represented</u> as the writer of the book or as the creator of the work, who presumably formally assumed responsibility for it. Thus, returning to the above-mentioned bibliography, the cataloger need not engage in any such broodings as Hanson's to determine whether the bibliographer or the library is to be considered "chiefly responsible" for it, but observe only who is <u>represented</u> as responsible for it. There are, of course, some cases of works erroneously or fictitiously misrepresented as the works of certain authors, and the cataloger need not knowingly

contribute to this misrepresentation. There are also some works purporting to convey spiritual communications which the cataloger might hesitate to attribute to the departed souls and prefer to regard the communicator rather than the purported spirit as responsible for the communication. But excepting such cases of established inaccurate or questionable attribution, the person represented as chiefly responsible for the work must realistically be regarded as its author. Thus the "author" might practically be defined as:

> The person or corporate body represented as chiefly responsible for the work, i.e., the one in whose name the work is issued and who is purportedly responsible for it--whatever the character of the work or the medium containing it--except when one has erroneously, fictitiously, or dubiously been represented as the author of the work; e.g. ... .

* *
*

The phrase "whatever the character of the work or the medium containing it" is deliberately added to specify that these are not to be regarded as qualifications of authorship. There is no apparent logical or practical reason why they should be. Nor does the existing definition imply the exclusion of any works or media. Actually, however, not all men and media are treated alike. One category of people tacitly excluded from considerations of authorship are performers. Thus, for example, while a recording of Abba Eban's speeches may be found in the Library of Congress catalog under his name, as author of the speeches:

Eban, Abba Solomon

Abba Eban's U.N. Speeches on the Middle East Crisis [Phonodisc]

the recording of Leonard Pennario's artistry on the piano will not be found

under his name but under the title of the recording:

The Best of Leonard Pennario in Stereo [Phonodisc]

The reasoning behind this discrimination is that the speeches delivered by Eban are his work, but the music performed by Pennario is not his work but that of various composers. This reasoning would be tenable if the music performed by Pennario had been that of a particular composer, as is Schumann's Piano Concerto in A Minor performed by him. In that case the recording would normally be represented as a rendition by Pennario of the work of Schumann (analogous to an edition or a translation of the work of a certain author) and the main entry would then appropriately be under the composer with an added entry for the performer. In the absence of any particular composer, however, it would seem that the recording could only be construed as exhibiting the work--the artistry--of Pennario, as is also implicit in the title The Best of Leonard Pennario, and the main entry should be under Pennario (analogously to the entry of translations of works of various authors by a certain translator under the name of the translator). Again, the denial to performers of the status of authorship is ignoring realities. If "the photographer who takes a photograph," as cited in the new definition, is an example of authorship, can it seriously be maintained that taking a photograph is more of an original and creative act than is performing a musical composition? It seems that the failure to recognize the work of performers is due primarily to an unconscious bias for "the book." Anything that can be put in the form of a book--photographs, chess games, calligraphy--is a product of authorship. The art and artistry of a singer, violinist, or pianist, cannot be conveyed by the medium of the book; hence, their works are orphans--they have no authors. They can be and are related in the catalog indirectly by means of added entries under the performers' names, but the main entries are under the titles. The consequence

is that under the subject or other added entries the works of performers will be separated by their titles. For example, under the subject heading Piano Music one will find together the works of a composer, because he is treated as author of his works, but not the works of a performer, because he is not so treated. These will be separated by their titles, as

The Best of Leonard Pennario

among the various entries under B, and

Pennario Plays Just for Fun

a distance away amont the entries under P. This does not contribute to the systematic structure of the catalog or its effective use.

Another category excluded from the principle of authorship in the Anglo-American rules are the works conveyed by means of motion pictures or filmstrips. In this case, it is no longer the authorship of the work that determines the main entry, but the medium--the fact that it is in the form of a motion picture or a filmstrip. The mere use of a film by one to convey and illustrate more effectively his ideas appears here to minimize his status as author. The rule governing the entry of works on film is brief and unqualified: "A film is entered under the title under which it is released."[16] Note the words "A film is entered," not "A work on film is entered," to denote that, in this case, the entry is determined by the character of the medium, not the character of the work--a complete reversal of the principle of authorship. True, the work embodied in the film and the person responsible for it are not altogether ignored. They are taken care of by another rule providing that an added entry is to be made for "the individual or individuals largely responsible for the subject content of an educational film--such as a lecturer, artist, or musician who is expressing his ideas, his art, or his music through the film medium."[17] But the main entry is still to be made for the film itself, as such, which is

identified by its title. Thus, again, a presentation of Abba Eban's speeches in the form of a book which could be read, or a recording which could be played and heard, will be entered under Eban's name as the author of the speeches; but the mere use of a film to enable one to see and hear Eban deliver his speeches will cause the film to be entered under its title, not under Eban's name as the author of the speeches conveyed by the film. While the film will still be found under Eban's name in the catalog as an added entry, it will be separated from the other editions of the speeches under the subject and the other added entries, as already explained before. The editions of Randall Farrell's poetry, and recordings of readings of his poetry, will be found together in the catalog under his name as the author of the poems; but the film showing him reading and explaining his poetry will not be found in the catalog among these works. The main entry will be found under the title of the film

Mr. Randall Farrell (motion picture)

. . . . . .

and an added entry will be found under his name as the subject, not the author, of the work recorded on the film. These two exceptions--of the works of performers and of works recorded on film--are calculated to impair the systematic structure of the catalog which the consistent use of a main entry based on the principle of authorship was intended to serve. This is especially detrimental at a time when the audiovisual materials comprising these two categories of works are on the ascendance, both in quantity and importance, in the library.

Process and Problems of Cataloging. With the objectives of the catalog in view, the main entry as a means, and the principle of authorship as a method to accomplish the objectives, the process of cataloging will normally involve the following steps:

1. Determination of "the entry"--i.e., selection of the person, corporate body, or title under which the main entry of a work should be made--and of the necessary added entries.
2. Determination of the name and the form of the name by which the person or corporate body should be identified in the catalog, the qualification of the name when required to distinguish it from similar names of other persons or corporate bodies, and the manner in which that name should be entered in the catalog so that it will most readily be found by those who will look for it.
3. Determination of the title by which the work, as distinct from the book, should be identified, and by which all its editions and translations, as well as other works in any way related to it, will be brought together in the catalog.
4. Description of the material cataloged--i.e., description of the book, film, tape, recording, or other medium containing the work.
5. Treatment of publications of corporate bodies.

The procedures to be followed in all these steps must be deliberately calculated to produce an integrated catalog which will serve best the catalog's objectives, i.e., (1) to facilitate the location of a particular book or item recorded in the catalog, and (2) to reveal to the catalog user in the same place in the catalog what editions, translations, and other representations the library has of that work, and what works it has of that author.

1. Entry of Work. The entry of a work under the person or corporate body represented as chiefly responsible for it--except when known that the attribution is erroneous, fictitious, or dubious--is most widely accepted and followed in modern catalogs as one designed to serve best both objectives of the catalog. Even the early catalogs which were concerned with the first objective only--to help in the location of a book in the library--

evidenced a predilection for entry under the author's name. Jefferson's entries "Collier's historical dict." for The Great Historical, Geographical, Genealogical and Poetical Dictionary . . . by Jer. Collier, and "Deane's intercepted letters" for Paris Papers, or Mr. Silas Deane's Late Intercepted Papers[18] . . . are typical of the entries in the early catalogs. There was an apparent distrust of the title of a book as a guide to its location, because the title was subject to abbreviation and manipulation, as Jefferson's own entries illustrate. In the modern catalog, the main entry under author is, additionally, essential to the second objective--to bring together the works of an author and the editions of a work under all relevant entries: the author, editor, translator, title, subject, and any other added entries.

But not all works are represented as ones for which a certain person or corporate body is chiefly responsible, and these have always been and continue to be a source of controversy and confusion. They include the following categories:

a. Works produced by a compiler or editor from the writings or the contributions of other authors. Examples of the former are anthologies, collections, readings, and similar publications produced from existing works of various authors, known or unknown, to form a convenient source of information on some subject or a selection of representative works. Examples of the latter are new works produced from the contributions of various authors invited to participate in them. In both cases, the compiler or editor may not have contributed any part to the contents of the work--except, presumably, his planning, selection of the material, composition, and editing of the work. Is the compiler or editor to be regarded in such cases as "chiefly responsible," because he has brought a new work into being, or is he to be regarded merely as an accessory, because he is not, and is not

represented as, the author of the contents of the work? The German school of thought generally denied the compiler or editor the status of authorship (although with some qualifications) and entered such works under their titles with added entries or references under the compilers or editors. The Anglo-American school of thought, however, considered the compiler and editor in such cases as quasi authors, and prescribed the entry of such works under the compiler or editor. The International Conference on Cataloging Principles, which achieved a remarkable agreement on all other points, was sharply divided on this issue.[19] In this case, however, the Anglo-American view can be demonstrated to be better calculated to serve the two objectives of the catalog than the German view, the considerations being similar to those which favor the principle of authorship.

In the treatment of such works, however, it is important to distinguish between those edited and compiled by the editor named, i.e., works actually brought into being by him, and those edited but not compiled by him, i.e., works brought into being by other known or unknown compilers, or by the collaborators themselves. Because works of the latter kind may be edited separately by various editors, entry under their respective editors would serve to scatter the editions of such works in the catalog. An interesting illustration of this consequence was provided by the early editions of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Puzzled initially by the question of how to enter these editions, some catalogers decided uncritically to treat them as collections of miscellaneous writings produced by the editors, and entered them under their respective editors. Then, realizing that this treatment was going to separate the editions of the same scrolls in the catalog, and also that persons looking for any edition of the scrolls but not knowing the editor or title of any edition would not find them in the catalog, they resorted to the use of subject entries under the heading "Dead Sea Scrolls"--thus

misrepresenting the editions of the scrolls as works about them and confusing the structure of the catalog. Collections or composite works which, like the Dead Sea Scrolls, are edited but not compiled or composed by the editor should be treated like other works of multiple authorship that have no principal author or compiler--as discussed in the next section.

b. Works of Multiple Authorship that have no principal author or compiler. Examples of this category are works of joint authorship, exchanges between several persons (as correspondence, conversations, debates) and collections which have no compilers or no known compilers (as the Dead Sea Scrolls or the Greek Anthology). In the absence of anyone represented as the principal author or compiler, a work of this category would appear to require always entry under its title. Tradition and usage, however, have favored the continued entry of a work of two or three authors, or of an exchange between two or three persons, under the one named first on the title page, with added entries under the others. This exception is both illogical and impractical. Logically, there is no apparent reason why this exception should be made for works of two or three authors, other than the weight of tradition. Practically, this exception entails problems when the order of the names differs on the title pages of the different editions, or when the authors are not named on the title page. To deal with these problems, special rules had to be provided. One prescribes that if, in a later edition, the order of the authors' names differs from that in the earlier edition, the entry should be under the author named first in the first edition--which complicates unnecessarily the process of cataloging, particularly if the library does not have the earlier edition. And another special rule prescribes that, if the authors are not named in the publication, the entry should be under the title--which will complicate matters if the library should later get another edition in which the authors will be named, and

which is also inconsistent with the first and basic rule directing entry under author whether or not the author is named in the work. This exception is particularly inept in the case of a work of two or three corporate bodies--as the Catalog Rules of 1908--issued simultaneously by these bodies, with each body named first in its own edition. And it is interesting to note that, despite the rule for works of two or three joint authors, the Catalog Rules of 1908 were entered in the Library of Congress catalog under title--presumably simply to avoid an incongruity.

A special type of composite works are those including different kinds of contributions--as a text by one with illustrations by another, a narrative by one with photographs by another, the music of a composer with words by an author, the reproductions of an artist's works with an essay about him, the letters of a person with a biographical sketch about him. In all such cases, who is to be regarded as the principal author? There is no one criterion applicable in all cases, but rather a series of criteria to determine what aspect of the work might be regarded of primary importance or interest. In some cases this is implicit in the character of the work. Given an illustrated work, or a musical score with an accompanying text, there will usually be little doubt that the illustrations in the first case and the accompanying text in the second are of subordinate importance. In other cases, the relative volume of the different contributions will indicate the primary purpose and interest of the work. Given a work consisting predominantly of reproductions of the works of an artist with an essay about him, the reproductions should be regarded as the principal aspec of the work. Where neither the character of the work nor the relative volume of the contributions can be regarded as determinant, the wording of the title might indicate the intent of the work. Failing these, the one named first on the title page should be treated as the principal author, if not

more than three contributors are involved; otherwise, the entry should be under title.

c. Works of changing authorship. Examples of this category are directories, encyclopedias, and similar reference works which need, and are intended, to be kept up-to-date by successive editions, and are therefore subject to changing authors or editors. Although any given edition may clearly appear as principally the work of a certain editor, entry under the editor would separate the editions of this continuing work in the catalog, and the entry should therefore be under the title of the work.

This condition has apparently vaguely been sensed in the former rules, and is reflected in several special rules for certain types of publications--e.g., "Enter almanacs . . . and similar serial publications under title," "Enter a directory published serially under the first word of the title . . ." "Enter a telephone directory . . . under title if published serially,"[20] the qualification "serially" meaning "intended to be continued in successive editions" and therefore subject to changing editorship--but the underlying condition has not been recognized and treated as such, and it continued as a festering problem. It was exposed in the course of the revision of the previous rules, and it was proposed that a work subject to change of authorship or editorship should be entered under title;[21] but the proposal was objected to as precarious and was set aside. The result is that, in the new rules, the original edition of the Directory of American Scholars is shown as entered under the editor, while the fourth edition is under its title[22]--a separation of editions contrary to the objectives of the catalog and the tenor of the new code as a whole. Obviously, no rule can require a cataloger to be clairvoyant or to be able to predict in all cases whether a work will become one of changing authorship; but neither can he ignore realities. Given a work like the Directory of American Scholars, which is

bound to become out-of-date in a few years and require periodically new editions, and one which could readily be continued by other editors, it should be considered sufficient to regard it, for these reasons, as a work potentially of changing editorship, and therefore one to be entered under title--without undue qualms about the possibility that it might never have another edition or editor. It is even more sinful bibliographically, however, to ignore a change of editorship in the successive editions of a work after it has occurred and to treat the editions as distinct works--as is done in the new rules.

d. Serials. The most typical illustration of works of changing authorship or editorship is the "serial," defined as "a publication issued in successive parts . . . and intended to be continued indefinitely," and including "periodicals, newspapers, annuals . . . the journals, memoirs, proceedings, transactions, etc., of societies, and numbered monographic series." Both the former and the new rules prescribe that a serial should be entered generally under its title, but both have exceptions in the case of serials issued by a corporate body. In the former rules, the exception was a serial whose title was not "distinctive," as Bulletin of, Journal of, Proceedings of, etc., followed by the name of the corporate body, in which case the entry was to be under the corporate body.[23] Since the qualification "distinctive" is a relative one, vexing questions arose when the title could not readily be classified as either "distinctive" or "indistinctive." There was also a feeling that serially published reports of a corporate body should be entered under the corporate body as author whether or not the title was distinctive. To remedy the situation, the new rules restrict the entry under title, in the case of serials issued by a corporate body, to those representing "a periodical, monographic series, or serially published bibliography, index, directory, biographical dictionary, almanac, or yearbook,"

and from these are further excepted those serials whose "title (exclusive of the subtitle) includes the name or the abbreviation of the name of the corporate body, or consists solely of a generic term that requires the name of the body for adequate identification of the serial," which are to be entered under the corporate body.[24] This new prescription may be more helpful to the cataloger in determining which serials of a corporate body should be entered under title and which under the issuing body, but there is no apparent reason to explain why a "serially published bibliography, index, directory, biographical dictionary, almanac, or yearbook" should require entry under title but no other serially published works. It may be recalled that the Introduction to the new code notes that "Earlier codes emphasized specific rules for various types of publications" and that such rules "tended to obscure underlying principles and basic system,"[25] but the rule for serials issued by a corporate body is based on nothing but "types of publications." If one scrutinizes the examples for some underlying criterion, one is further puzzled to find the Statistical Abstract of the United States entered under title, but the Carload Waybill Statistics under the issuing corporate body. There is a note under the former saying that it is a "Yearbook issued successively by various agencies of the U.S. Government," but it is not clear whether the reason for its entry under title is the fact that it is a "yearbook" or the fact that it is "issued successively by various agencies." There is no note under the Carload Waybill Statistics, but the Library of Congress catalog shows that it is also a yearbook. A footnote to the rule explains that "The term 'yearbook' is to be understood to exclude a work the content of which is necessarily the expression of the corporate thought or activity of the body . . .," but this note would appear to apply equally to both examples. One must conclude that the reason why the Statistical Abstract of the United States is entered under its title

is the fact that it is "issued successively by various agencies." This is a good reason, but this reason invokes the criterion of "works of changing authorship" not recognized in the new rules and potentially applicable also to Carload Waybill Statistics.

If one were to inquire about the reason why serials are so generally entered under title, he would very likely be told that it is because they are "best known" by their titles. This might be a valid reason if the question of main entry involved no other considerations. It was the determinant reason in the early catalogs, and may still be found in primitively fashioned catalogs, whose objective, as already noted, is merely to aid in the location of a particular publication. Adoption of the second objective of the modern catalog to relate together the works of an author and the editions of a work, and with it the use of multiple entries to serve multiple purposes, has made this reason obsolete. The fact that a work may be "best known" by its title is a reason for an entry to be made under the title, but not necessarily for the main entry. If the second objective is also to be served, the main entry, as already explained before, will need to be under its author. That is why the first rule emphasizes "Enter a work . . . under the person or corporate body that is the author, whether named in the work or not."[26] Certainly a work whose author is not named in it will generally be "best known" by its title, but this is no longer a reason for the main entry to be made under the title. The purpose can equally well be served by a title added entry.

There is one reason, and only one reason, why a serial, unlike a monograph, could not generally be entered under its corporate author or personal editor--and that is that, because it is "intended to be continued indefinitely," it is subject to change of authorship or editorship. The Library Journal, which began as "official organ of the Library Associations of

America and of the United Kingdom," later became the "official organ of the American Library Association," and ultimately a private professional organ. The vicissitudes of The Library, which began as "official organ of the Library Association of the United Kingdom," were similar. Special Libraries, which until January 1969 carried the banner "Official Organ, Special Libra ies Association," no longer does it and the editorial in the January 1969 issue suggests that this is not the result of an accident or oversight. But if one recognizes that the reason for the entry of serials under title is that they are subject to change of authorship, one will also be led to recognize the conditions when this reason does not obtain. Looking at the present organs of the American and the British Library Associations, the A.L.A. Bulletin and the Library Association Record, one will readily note that these cannot succumb to the fate of their predecessors, simply because the inclusion of the initials of one and of the name of the other of the issuing bodies in the titles of these serials makes them inseparable from these bodies. Again, looking at some annual reports of libraries, or other "house organs," issued under catchy titles, it will also be realized that a serial limited, largely or exclusively, to the business or proceedings of a particular body is also not susceptible to a change of the issuing body, regardless of the character of the title. Both these conditions--a title including the initials or the full name of the issuing body, or a contents limited largely to the activities, business, or proceedings of the issuing body--are rational and practical reasons for entry of such serials under their issuing bodies as authors or compilers.

Because of its indefinite continuity, a serial is also subject to change of title in a manner significantly more consequential than that occasionally encountered in monographic works. When such a change occurs, three courses of action present themselves: (1) to leave the serial under

the original title, with appropriate notes added on the original entry to explain the changes that have taken place, and references or added entries made under the new title; (2) to recatalog the serial under its latest title, with notes to explain the changes that have taken place, and references or added entries made under the earlier title; (3) to treat each title as representing a different serial (excepting minor variations in wording and changes of short duration) with explanatory notes to relate them. While each of these courses may be justified on logical and practical grounds, and may be preferable in certain circumstances, the third course is in general to be recommended for the following reasons: (a) a serial is, in its course of existence, susceptible to a change of scope and character which makes it in fact a different serial, and the new title may well signify that such a change has taken place, despite the continued numbering of the volumes; (b) a serial does not have the organic unity of a monographic work, it is rather a source of various works, and both the one who cites and the one who looks for a serial is almost always concerned with the part identified by a particular title, not the history of the whole serial; (c) this course is technically more suitable to the changing course of a serial.

e. Works of unknown or uncertain authorship. The principle of authorship and the purposes of the catalog require that a work of known authorship should always be entered under the author--whether or not he is named in it. If such a work is published anonymously, a title added entry will obviously be required to facilitate its location in the catalog; and if it is attributed to another person, an explanatory note and an added entry under that person will be required. The main entry, however, is not affected by these conditions. A work of unknown authorship can usefully be entered only under the title by which it is best known or by which it can best be identified (as discussed below). A work of unknown authorship

inaccurately, doubtfully, or uncertainly attributed to an author has been treated formerly in three different ways. Some works generally but falsely attributed to a certain author were entered under that author, followed by the qualification "Spurious works." Other works uncertainly attributed to an author were entered under that author, followed by the qualification "supposed author." Still other works doubtfully attributed to an author were entered under title, with an explanatory note and an added entry under that author.[27] The practical value of these fine distinctions did not appear to compensate for the complexity they contributed to the process of cataloging and to the structure of the catalog. They were therefore abandoned in the course of the recent revision, and have been replaced by one simple rule providing that all such works should be entered uniformly under title, with explanatory notes, and added entries under the purported authors.[28] This is not only a more practical rule, but one that will also serve to distinguish more meaningfully and consistently between the works of an author and those inaccurately, doubtfully, or uncertainly attributed to him.

A practical exception is to be made, however, in the case of works of ancient origin traditionally and universally attributed to a certain character--as the Fables of Aesop--which are generally entered under their purported author without qualification, even if the very existence of that character is in doubt.

f. Revisions and adaptations. Revisions and adaptations represent modifications of an author's original works. Revisions are normally intended to bring a certain work up-to-date; adaptations are made for particular purposes--as adaptations for children, for use as a motion picture script, a dramatization, and so on. Both may differ from the original work in various ways and varying degrees, and present the problem of whether or

when they should be entered under the original author with an added entry under the reviser or adapter, or vice versa. Under the former rules the cataloger was required to determine whether or not a given revision was "substantially a new work," whether the adaptation bore more than a "slight kinship with the original work,"[29] and decide the entry on this basis. It should be apparent that, whatever their ideological value, practically these criteria could only be frustrating, if taken seriously, and conducive to much inconsistency. Nor are they unavoidable. A revision might best be treated in accordance with the way it is represented. As long as it is represented as a revised edition of the work of the original author, it should be treated as an edition and entered under the original author. If it is represented as a work "by" the reviser based on, or forming an edition of, the work of the original author, it should be so treated and entered under the reviser, with an added entry under the original author to relate it to the original work. In the case of adaptations, however, there are tangible literary criteria. A work that is rewritten (as for children) or reconstructed (as for performance on the stage) should be entered under the adapter, with an added entry under the original author to relate it to the original work. The idea of "le style est l'homme" is a more tangible and meaningful criterion for determining primary authorship than the vague notion implicit in the definition that the author is the one responsible for "the intellectual content of the work"--a notion undoubtedly responsible for much of the vagueness and confusion in the former rules.

In applying the criteria suggested, however, one should be aware of the fact that the term "adaptation" may be used in a sense different from that used here. For example, a German work "adapted" for use as a textbook is most likely to be an abridged and annotated edition of the work, not one rewritten or reconstructed, and should be treated as an edition of the original work.

2. Choice, Qualification, and Entry of Name. When the entry of a work has been determined, the names under which the main or added entries are to be made may present the following questions:

a. Choice of name and of form of name. If an author appears in his works, or is otherwise known, under more than one name or one form of the name--as under his real name and an assumed name, family name and title of nobility, secular name and name in religion, full name and brief name--the purposes of the catalog require that he should be identified in it by one name and one form of the name only, with references to it from the other names and the other forms of the name under which he might be sought. But the choice of the name and of the form of the name has been a subject of great controversy, with strong arguments in support of each alternative. Those who favored the real name and the full name invoked the argument of realism and stability in cataloging, while those who favored the name and form of the name used by the author in his works invoked the convenience of the catalog user who is likely to know the author best by this name. In the matter of family name versus title of nobility, the British favored the choice of the family name over the title of nobility in order to prevent separation of members of the same family in the catalog, and taunted the Americans for abolishing nobility in practice but preserving it in the catalog; but the Americans considered the British arguments as irrelevant to the purposes of cataloging, and disagreed with the British on this point. Seeking to embody the best of all arguments, the former rules adopted as a general principle the "full" and "most authentic" name, but not without some consideration for the "author's usage" and the name by which he was "best known" "when the most authentic [name] has been but little used and another form has been in use predominantly both by the person concerned and in records and literature."[30] Given such difficult qualifications, the results

often reflected the temper of the cataloger rather than any principle. The conservative cataloger, to be quite safe, entered Mozart under his full name as Mozart, Johann Chrysostom Wolfgang Amadeus; While the more liberal, relying more on the author's own usage, entered Casals under the form of name used by him, as Casals, Pablo, not under his full name "Salvador Casals, Pablo Carlos." Two Library of Congress catalogers, using the same rules, had different answers for similar questions. One entered Will Durant under his full name Durant, William James, not "Durant, Will" as found in his works; while the other noted that John Dos Passos' full name was John Roderigo Dos Passos, but entered him under Dos Passos, John because the author himself used this brief form of the name. If the question of choice of name were to be considered in light of the objectives of the catalog, and in this light only, it would seem apparent that these objectives would best be served if an author were entered in the catalog under the name by which he is commonly identified in his works--whether that is his real name, assumed name, nickname, or title of nobility. The argument in support of this principle has most persuasively been stated by Augustus De Morgan. Explaining his reason for using the Latin names of those who wrote in Latin rather than their vernacular names, he said: "It is well to know that Copernicus, Dasypodius, Xylander, Regiomontanus, and Clavius were Gepernik, Rauchfuss, Holtzmann, Nüller and Schlüssel. But as the butchers' bills of these eminent men are all lost, and their writings only remain, it is best to designate them by the name they bear on the latter, rather than the former."[31] Of course, an author may not be consistent in his use of the full or brief name, and may also use simultaneously different names in different works. In this case, the use of the full name and of the real name is a logical choice--but not as a general principle.

Another question of choice of name arises when an author has changed

his or her name--as in consequence of marriage, or change of citizenship. In earlier times, the continued use of the earlier name, with a reference from the later name, was favored for economical and technological reasons--to avoid changing the earlier entries in the catalog. In modern cataloging, the last name has been favored, with a reference from the earlier name, as a means of keeping the catalog up-to-date.

b. Qualification of name. The objective of the catalog to show what works the library has of a particular author requires that the author should be adequately identified and distinguished from others of the same name, so that their works will not be confused. This raises the question of the means by which authors of the same name can best be distinguished. The means used in earlier catalogs reflected the customs of the times. In the British Museum catalog, for example, such authors are distinguished by their titles, occupations, or places of residence. All of these, however, are much more subject to change in modern times than they used to be, and are therefore not dependable as identifying designations. The means used in modern Anglo-American cataloging as a primary qualification are the dates of birth and death of a person. Where these are available, they serve best to distinguish persons of the same name, although the catalog user in search of one of these authors may not readily recognize the author he wants. Where these dates are not available, the designations used by the author himself in his works are a secondary means. In the absence of dates--which include approximate dates--and designations used in the author's own works, it is best to leave such authors temporarily unidentified. There are two other methods that have been used in such cases and should be abandoned. One is a designation manufactured by the cataloger himself on the basis of the subject of the work. Commenting on this method, one cataloger related at a meeting about a book on the art of cooking he once received which he

found was written by one who had previously published a collection of poetry and had been designated in the catalog as poet. The other method to be avoided is prescribed in one of the new rules: "If further differentiation is required, add . . . other forenames not customarily used by the author."[32] This means that if the full name of a certain John Smith, who could not otherwise be distinguished from other unidentified John Smiths, were found to be, say, Xenophon John Smith, he should then be entered in the catalog under his full name Smith, Xenophon John, not under Smith, John as he is named in his work or works. Now, it is difficult to see how this method will serve the objectives of the catalog. It certainly will not help, but hinder, the reader who may have to look for a certain work of that John Smith under his name--as when he is uncertain about the exact title of that work. It might help the cataloger to bring together the works of this John Smith; but even if he did, how is the catalog user, unaware of the cataloger's discovery, to find these works under Smith, Xenophon John? Obviously a reference from Smith, John to Smith, Xenophon John would be meaningless. To avail himself of John Smith's full name as a means to distinguish him from the other John Smiths and yet to leave him in the catalog under the name under which he is likely to be sought, the cataloger might use the unused forename as a qualification rather than as a part of the name--that is, as Smith, John (i.e., Smith, Xenophon John). This would cause this John Smith to stand in the catalog together with the other John Smiths, where he would be sought, and yet be distinguished from them by the qualification following his name.

c. Entry of name. The question of entry of the name of a person in the catalog arises from the fact that personal names are customarily listed not directly under the form used by the person, but under an inverted form--that is, the name John Smith is not listed in any directory or

reference work under this form, but under the inverted form Smith, John. Because the customs relating to the treatment of personal names differ in different countries, the question of entry must be faced in dealing with names of foreign authors, particularly in the case of compound names and names including prefixes. For example, in Germany, the name Verner von Braun would be listed under the letter B, as Braun, Verner von, but in English-speaking countries it would be listed under the letter V, as Von Braun, Verner. This question has always troubled the cataloger, first, because he was not always sure how a given name was treated in the country of its bearer; second, because he was not always quite sure which was the individual's home country--that is, whether a given Von Braun was a German citizen or an American citizen; and, lastly, he was troubled by the thought that his efforts to ascertain the country and the customs of a person would not be helpful to most users of the catalog who would not know these facts and would probably be confused by the entry of one Von Braun under Von and another under Braun. Seeking a compromise which, on the one hand, would reduce the complexity of the differences, and, on the other, would not do too much violence to foreign names, the cataloger arbitrarily "split the differences," following the customs of the country in the better known cases (as in the treatment of the prefixes von and de in the names of German and French authors) and ignoring them in the less known cases (as in the treatment of the prefixes vom or zum in German, and in sacrificing the prefix de in Italian in the interest of uniformity with the names of French authors). This method may have had its merits in earlier days, when people were more parochial in their outlook and interests and were generally unfamiliar with foreign names. In modern times, this method has tended to make the catalog increasingly anachronistic, and it has become increasingly apparent that the catalog cannot arbitrarily impose a pattern on the names

of people from other countries any more than it could ignore the accepted pattern of its own country. This led in the course of the revision to the principle that, in the entry of names in the catalog, the customs prevailing in the country of the bearer of the name should be followed, and this principle was adopted by the International Conference in Paris.[33] This principle, however, presents one important practical difficulty for both the cataloger and the catalog user. This difficulty arises in those cases where authors using the same language belong to countries differing in their treatment of the same kind of names--as the treatment of the prefix de in the names of French and Belgian authors writing in French. Because of this difficulty, it has been deemed best in the Anglo-American rules, for bibliographical purposes, to modify the principle and provide that the name of a person should be treated in accordance with the customs prevailing in the language used by him.[34] This means, for example, that the name of a French writer would be treated as that of a Frenchman, whatever his citizenship.

3. Identification of Work. The work of an author is generally identified by the title under which it is published, which is normally regarded not only as a description of the contents but also as the name of the work. There is no problem of identification as long as a work is found under one particular title. But the editions of a work may be issued, sometimes simultaneously, under different titles,[35] and the translations usually have different titles. If these editions and translations are to be related and displayed in the catalog as representations of the same work, then one title must be selected to identify the work and to relate its editions and translation, just as one particular name must be selected to identify an author and to relate his works together. The problem involved was recognized by Panizzi who provided a special rule for the entry of all editions and translation of the Old and New Testament under the word "Bible" in

order to prevent their separation under their individual titles,[36] and another rule for "Translations to be entered immediately after the original, generally with only the indication of the language into which the version has been made."[37] It is noteworthy that although Panizzi's rule for the Bible has been expanded in the course of time in the Anglo-American rules to provide a similar treatment for all "Anonymous Classics," the underlying problem has not been recognized as one of a general character to which all works are subject, whether or not anonymous and whether or not classics, and no solution was provided to deal with it generally wherever found. Editions and translations of "anonymous classics" were entered, like the Bible, under particular titles by which the works were best known, and by means of which their editions and translations were related in the catalog; editions and translations of other anonymous works were entered directly under their individual titles, but were indirectly related by means of added entries under the original titles; editions and translations of the works of authors were entered, after their authors' names, under their individual titles, and were not related in any way, except for notes on the translations and the editions issued under other titles about the original title of the work. One consequence of the last method is interestingly illustrated by the experience of a bibliographer at the large card catalog of the Library of Congress. Compiling a list of the editions of the works of Ralph Waldo Emerson, she found under the title The American Scholar editions published in 1893 and later, but no earlier editions which she was sure the Library of Congress would have. It was not until she worked her way through the many entries under Emerson's name and reached the letter O that she unexpectedly came upon two editions entitled An Oration Delivered Before the Phi Beta Kappa Society, at Cambridge, August 31, 1837, published respectively in 1837 and 1838, the first of which luckily carried the note "Usually

entitled 'The American Scholar.'"[38] There, then, were the first two editions of The American Scholar which almost escaped her. What she could not understand and complained about, however, was why, if the cataloger did know that these were editions of The American Scholar, did he allow them to be separated from the other editions and hidden where few would find them? Surely, she felt, this was less than helpful to the catalog user.

Under the new Anglo-American rules, this would not happen, because the early editions would be related to the other editions by using the title American Scholar as a "uniform title," thus:

> Emerson, Ralph Waldo
> [American Scholar]
> An Oration Delivered Before the Phi Beta Kappa Society,
> at Cambridge, August 31, 1837 . . .

with a reference from

> Emerson, Ralph Waldo
> An Oration Delivered Before the Phi Beta Kappa Society,
> at Cambridge, August 31, 1837
> see his
> American Scholar.

The selection of the "uniform title" to identify the work is similar to the selection of the name of the author. Early works, and others of which there are no original editions or which have no original titles, are best identified by the designations by which they are most commonly identified in their published editions, in literary history, or other relevant sources--as Beowulf, Codex Brucianus, Dead Sea Scrolls. Other works are generally best identified by their original titles, except, as in the case of the American Scholar, the original title was early abandoned and the subsequent editions have been issued consistently under another title, in which case this title is to be preferred.

The entry of translations under the original title, which might be in a language quite unfamiliar to most users of the catalog, has been criticized as calculated to make their location more difficult. This entry is

nevertheless requisite in a library whose holdings are intended to include the original editions as well as the translations, for the following reasons: (a) the original is the real title by which the author himself has named his work; (b) there is only one original title, but there may be a variety of translated titles, in the same language or different languages, and the selection of one particular translated title to identify the work would be both difficult and subject to change as new and more popular translations are received; (c) since translations are generally received after the original editions have been cataloged, the use of a translated title to identify the work and relate all its editions and translations would require recataloging of all original editions when the translations are received; (d) since most works will have no translations, the entry of those that will have translations under their translated titles will mean that works in foreign languages will appear in the catalog sometime under the original title and sometime under a translated title--a condition not conducive to an understanding of the structure of the catalog by its user. However, in a library whose holdings are not intended to include the original editions, the entry of translations under a translated title--but one particular title only for a given work--would be more useful. Thus Chekhov's Cherry Orchard could be entered

Chekhov, Anton.
The Cherry Orchard, a play in
four acts . . . translated from the
Russian by . . .

without the uniform title Vishnevyi Sad, which is the original title. In this case, however, the translation entitled The Cherry Garden should also be entered under the title selected, not under its own title, thus:

Chekhov, Anton.
[Cherry Orchard]
The Cherry Garden; a comedy in
four acts . . . translated from the Original Russian
by . . .

with a reference from

Chekhov, Anton
The Cherry Garden

see his

Cherry Orchard

and the subject and added entries of related works should include the translated title selected instead of the original title used on standard catalog cards:

Logan, Joshua
The Wisteria Trees, an American play based on Anton Chekhov's The Cherry Orchard . . .

I. Chekhov, Anton. Cherry Orchard.

The consistent use of a "uniform title" to identify a work and relate its editions and translations is one of the significant features of the new rules.

4. Description of Material. After the main and added entries have been determined; the author and others under whom the work is to be entered, and the work itself, have been properly identified; and the necessary references from other names and titles have been indicated, then the time has come for the last step in the process of descriptive cataloging--description of the material embodying the work. Since the materials of a library are normally provided with tags designed to identify them and describe their contents, these tags have naturally been used as a basis of description of the materials. Hence the rules of description for books, prior to their revision published in 1949, were based primarily on a principle of "transcription" of the title page intended to mirror this tag, "the face of the book," in the entry. The purpose of this principle seemed understandable, but its implementation involved problems stemming from the fact that the title pages of books, including those of editions of the same work, are

often heterogeneous in design, while the entries must be uniformly designed to form an integrated catalog. To reconcile the principle of transcription with the requirements of the entry, two basic measures were adopted. First, anything appearing on the title page before the title proper of the book was to be omitted in the transcription of the title page, the omission marked by three dots, and the omitted element given in an "at head of title" note. The mark of omission together with the note were then to convey an idea of the appearance of the elements on the title page. Second, the elements of the imprint were to be given in a fixed order--place, publisher, date--regardless of their order on the title page. As a result of these rules, the edition statement, which is often of critical importance in the selection of a particular edition, would sometimes appear in the entry after the title, where it logically belongs and is normally found on the title page, but sometimes be hidden in a note if the designer of the title page chose to place it either at the head or on the verso of the title page. The principle of "transcription" also left open the question of what should or should not be included in the entry. It was apparent that not everything printed on the title page was always relevant to the purposes of the catalog, and that not everything required for these pruposes was always found on the title page. There was a number of rules for omissions and additions, but no general principle that would underlie the rules and that might be used as a criterion in the absence of any specific rule. Finally, the principle of "transcription" became increasingly difficult to apply in cataloging books with fancifully designed title pages. There was only one argument in support of this principle--an untested assumption that it was essential to a positive identification of the edition which otherwise might be confused with another edition of the work. A test of this assumption failed to sustain it and cleared the way for a revision of the rules of description.[39]

The essence of the revision of these rules consisted, first, of a clarification that the purposes of description were (1) to identify the book so as to distinguish it from other books representing different works or different editions of the same work, and (2) to characterize its contents so as to help the catalog user select the source that might serve him best. This meant that the entry was to include those items which were necessary or desirable either for the identification or for the characterization of the source, and only these items, regardless of the contents of the title page. Second, the revision prescribed a fixed order for the organization of the contents of the entry which would respond to the interests of the catalog user and improve the integration of the catalog. The items selected from the title page were to be "transcribed" accurately, but not necessarily in the order in which they appeared on the title page, and without indication of that order. Items supplied from other sources in the description of the material--for example, the edition statement from the verso of the title page--were, however, to be enclosed in brackets to indicate that they were not on the title page, in order not to impair identification of the material. Thus the former principle of "transcription" has not been entirely eliminated, but restricted to the extent necessary for the purposes of identification. The title page as such is no longer transcribed, but the principal items of the title page used in the entry are. The contents and organization of the entry are determined, not by the title page, but by its own purposes and requirements.

5. Publications of Corporate Bodies. Publications of corporate bodies introduce special problems which complicate particularly the process of cataloging and must be considered separately. These problems, which have been among the most frustrating in cataloging and the subject of much discussion, stem from the fact that (a) the very essence of a corporate body--

that is, what constitutes a corporate body in cataloging--is not quite as self-evident as may be assumed; (b) since the acts and communications of corporate bodies are not always represented explicitly as such, and since, furthermore, corporate bodies often act and speak through individuals who may represent them but who may also speak in their own names, there is a special problem of determining when a publication of a corporate body should be regarded as an expression of that body, and when not; (c) since the identity and name of a corporate body are different in character from those of an individual, the question of choice of name by which a corporate body should be identified and of entry of that name in the catalog has been the subject of considerable controversy; and (d) since, unlike individuals, corporate bodies have subdivisions--as departments, sections, bureaus, offices, etc.--the treatment of such subdivisions presents a special problem.

a. Corporate body. Despite the attention and thought devoted to the treatment of publications of corporate bodies in Anglo-American cataloging, no definition was provided in the rules prior to 1967 of what constituted a "corporate body" in cataloging. Jewett in his original rule on corporate authorship spoke of "bodies of men, under whatever name, and for whatever purpose," which suggests that he would have defined a corporate body as a group of persons, identified by whatever name, and organized for whatever purpose--an unexceptional definition. This concept was reinforced by a long list of examples including "Academies, institutes, associations, universities, colleges; literary, scientific, economical eleemosynary, or religious societies. . ." etc.[40] Cutter's general principle "Bodies of men are to be considered as authors of works published in their name . . ."[41] might also have been construed as implying that a corporate body was a group of individuals identified by a certain name; but his inclusion among the works of corporate authorship of "anonymous publications of any class (not

organized) of citizens," such as an "Application to Parliament by the merchants of London" which was to be entered under "London. Merchants"[42] meant that any group of individuals, whether or not it had a name, was to be regarded as constituting a corporate body and might be treated as a corporate author. The situation became vaguer in the 1908 rules, where Cutter's general principle was relegated to a definition: "Corporate entry. Entry under the names of bodies or organizations for works published in their name . . .,"[43] and the rule for publications of classes of citizens was retained verbatim.[44] In the 1949 rules, however, the situation became considerably more confused. On the one hand, the rule for "Classes of citizens" assumed larger proportions and an esoteric character that would baffle not only the user but even the maker of the catalog--for example, the entry of a "Celebration of the ninetieth anniversary of American independance [!] in Geneva (Suisse) July 4th, 1866 . . ." under "Geneva. American residents."[45] On the other hand, "official accounts and publications of results of scientific and exploring expeditions" and "the official log of a ship,"[46] which by their very characterization as "official" records would have been expected to be treated as works of corporate bodies, were not included in the chapter dealing with "Corporate Bodies" but elsewhere among the rules for Manuscripts, Maps, Music, and Works of Art, forming together a group of "Works of Special Type." The failure to recognize the official reports of an expedition and of a ship company as works of corporate bodies suggests the possibility that the names of expeditions and ships were not readily recognized as designating also particular groups of persons identified by them and thus constituting corporate bodies. It was then apparent that an adequate definition of what was a "corporate body" was prerequisite to any discussion of the problem of corporate authorship, and for cataloging purposes, the following definition was adopted in the new rules: "Corporate

body. An organization or group of persons that is identified by a name and that acts or may act as an entity."[47] This is probably what Jewett meant to imply when he originally referred to "bodies of men, under whatever name, and for whatever purpose," but Cutter's introduction of "anonymous publications" of unnamed classes of citizens as works of corporate authorship introduced the confusion that followed. The definition adopted excludes the anonymous publications of classes of citizens, which are to be treated under the new rules as other anonymous publications--that is, entered under title. On the other hand, the official reports of any group of persons representing any named institution or undertaking--including expeditions and ships--are prima-facie examples of works of corporate authorship requiring no special rules. The meaning of the definition would be made clearer, however, if the qualification "particular" were included in it to read: "Corporate body. A <u>particular</u> organization or group of persons that is identified by a <u>particular</u> name . . ." This would help to distinguish better between a general description of a class of citizens ("the merchants of London") and the name of a particular group ("The Merchants Association of London").

b. <u>Corporate author</u>. It was easy to recognize the principle of corporate authorship--it seemed logical and consistent to say that a corporate body, like an individual, should be treated as the author of its acts and works; but it has been much more difficult to implement it, because corporate bodies and their actions are so much more complex in their nature than are individuals and their works. Jewett's original rule--"Academies, institutes, associations, universities, colleges . . . . or other bodies of men, under whatever name, and for whatever purpose, issuing publications . . . are to be considered and treated as the authors of all works issued by them, and in their name alone"[48]--sounded fairly uncomplicated.

But when one turned to the "Examples" for illustrations of the meaning of the rule, that meaning became clouded. One could see the "Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London" and the "School Laws of Rhode Island" as examples of publications of corporate bodies "issued by them, and in their name alone," because the Royal Society of London, and the state of Rhode Island, are specifically named in the titles as the authors of the works. But the British Museum publication "A short guide to that portion of the library of printed books now open to the public" and the "Catalogue of Columbia College, in the City of New York" do not specifically name the British Museum and Columbia College as the authors of these works, and yet are treated as "issued . . . in their name." What, then, was the phrase "issued . . . in their name" intended to mean? One might infer from the fact that these publications were issued by these bodies, that they report on the activities of these bodies, and that they name no individuals as authors or compilers, that they were most probably intended as communications of these bodies and should be treated as such. But this is an inference scarcely implicit in the phrase "issued . . . in their name."

Cutter's "General principle" which appeared a quarter of a century later, although much briefer than Jewett's rule, was much more comprehensive. It stated "Bodies of men are to be considered as authors of works published in their name or by their authority." The addition of "or by their authority" recognized an important fact, that communications of corporate bodies are not always specified as such and yet may bear the authority of the bodies issuing them, as illustrated by the Guide of the British Museum and the Catalogue of Columbia College mentioned before; and these should therefore be treated as works of their issuing bodies. But the problem which Cutter's principle raised was one of necessary limitation: are not all publications of corporate bodies (other, of course, than commercial publishers) issued "by their authority"? Cutter's principle was,

in essence, sound and a distinct improvement on Jewett's rule, but its application was to remain a difficult problem. In the subsequent three editions, Cutter's specific rules relating to the treatment of publications of corporate bodies underwent a continuous expansion and change, but his basic principle of corporate authorship remained unchanged.

If Cutter's general principle of corporate authorship was in need of further specification, it did, like a compass, point out the cardinal directions to guide one in the development of the specifications needed. The Catalog Rules of 1908, which succeeded Cutter's rules, jettisoned this compass, and henceforth the concept of corporate authorship became vaguer and vaguer. The substance of Cutter's principle, without its imperative mode, was used--as mentioned before--as a definition of the term "Corporate entry," where it read "Entry under the names of bodies or organizations for works published in their name or by their authority."[49] But there was no one general rule to state which publications should be treated as works of corporate authorship. The 1949 rules, published three quarters of a century after Cutter's principle was first published, provided a "General rule" in place of Cutter's "General principle." The rule was obviously much more labored and elaborate than Cutter's concise principle, but also much more obscure. It stated: "Governments and their agencies, societies, institutions, firms, conferences, etc., are to be regarded as the authors of publications for which they, as corporate bodies, are responsible"[50]--which is nothing but a tautology. As if recognizing the weakness of the statement, the rule went on to illustrate it by adding: "Such material as official publications of governments; proceedings and reports of societies; official catalogs of libraries and museums; reports of institutions, firms, conferences, and other bodies is entered under the heading for the corporate body, even though the name of the individual preparing it is given." But a list

of examples, however long, is not an adequate substitution for a needed criterion, and is not of much help when the rule itself illustrated by it is basically weak.

Attempting a more helpful explanation of what is to be regarded as a "Work of Corporate Body," the unfinished draft of 1960 proposed the following:

> "A work which, explicitly or implicitly, represents an act, communication, or product of the activity of a corporate body is entered under the name of that body . . . This includes (a) the proceedings, translations, debates, reports and other works produced by or issued in the name of a corporate body; (b) administrative, regulatory, and other official documents--such as constitutions, rules, decisions, periodic reports of activities, announcements, guides, catalogs--which, even if produced by an individual, implicitly bear the authority of the issuing body; and (c) works issued by a corporate body, other than a commercial publisher, without the name of an author or compiler and not represented as anonymous works."[51]

This rule, which may be regarded as a more specific and detailed restatement of Cutter's principle, is aimed at two purposes. First, to point out that corporate authorship may be either explicit or implicit; and second, to illustrate explicit authorship as including works produced collectively by corporate bodies or issued in their names, and implicit authorship as including works which by their contents, character, or manner of presentation are clearly expressions of their issuing bodies. In the new rules, the rule relating to "Works of corporate authorship," based on the wording adopted at the International Conference in Paris, reads:

"Enter under a corporate body . . . a work that is by its nature necessarily the expression of the corporate thought or activity of the body. Such works include official records and reports, and statements, studies, and other communications dealing with the policies, operations, or management of the body made by officers or other employees of the body . . ."[52]

This rule seems, however, not as an improvement on that of the unfinished draft, but rather as a retreat from the more specific to the more general, and from the more concrete to the more abstract. The intent of this rule is further obscured by a subsequent rule which reads:

"Enter under the corporate body a work, other than a formal history, describing the body, its functions, procedures, facilities, resources, etc. or an inventory, catalog, directory of personnel, list of members, etc."[53]

This rule, as it stands, is rather puzzling. Certainly "a work . . . describing the body, its functions . . . etc." could not justifiably be regarded as an expression of the body unless certain other conditions also obtained--as when the work was prepared by an officer or employee of the body and was issued by that body--but the rule states no conditions. Again, where these conditions do obtain, this rule is unnecessary, for that situation is already covered by the previous rule: "Such works include official records . . . and other communications dealing with the policies, operations, or management of the body made by officers or other employees of the body." These two rules seem to leave the critical question of which publications should be treated as works of corporate authorship more vaguely answered than it is by the rule of the unfinished draft of 1960.

c. Corporate name and entry. The cataloging of works of corporate bodies naturally involves also the questions of choice of name by which a

corporate body should be identified in the catalog, method of distinguishing a corporate body from other bodies having similar names, and form of entry of the name in the catalog. The question of choice of name of a corporate body is similar to that of an individual, and the principle adopted in one case should be followed also in the other. Under the former rules, as already mentioned, the official and full name was required in both cases; under the new rules, the name by which an individual or corporate body is commonly identified in his or its works is the name by which he or it should be identified in the catalog. There is a difference, however, in the case of a change of name. Whereas an individual who changed his name remains the same and all his works are to be entered under his last name, as discussed before, a corporate body may be viewed as actually undergoing a constant change of identity, and the works of a corporate body whose name has changed may best be entered separately under the names under which they were issued, with notes made to link the different names. Although this view may be contested, it will be found theoretically tenable and practically more useful than the alternative view. To regard, for example, the Pennsylvania State University, and its predecessor the Pennsylvania State College, and its predecessor the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, and its predecessor the Farmers' High School, as being all the same institution, and to enter the works of the Farmers' High School and of the Agricultural College etc. as being all the works of the Pennsylvania State University, is not only to assume an endless amount of recataloging (and partly of reclassification), but also to produce an impractical catalog. It would probably also surprise the Pennsylvania State University to find itself in the catalog charged with responsibility for the works of its predecessors!

The method of distinguishing corporate bodies with similar names has never been considered as a problem. It seemed natural to distinguish

corporate bodies of a local character by place of location, those of a state or national character by the state or country, and others by similarly appropriate designations.

The entry of the name of a corporate body in the catalog, however, offers an instructive lesson. When Jewett first presented his rule for the treatment of publications of "bodies of men," he was obviously conscious of the need of a criterion to determine which publications should be treated as the works of corporate authorship; but the entry of the corporate name apparently never raised any question in his mind. In the "Examples" supplied by him, the British Museum, the College of New Jersey, and the United States Military Academy are all entered directly under these names as they appear on the publications cited. But when Cutter first set forth his general principle that "Bodies of men are to be considered as authors of works published in their name by their authority," he went on to note:

> "The chief difficulty with regard to bodies of men is to determine (1) what their names are and (2) whether the name or some other word shall be the heading. In regard to (2) the catalogues hitherto published may be regarded as a series of experiments. No satisfactory usage has as yet been established . . ."[54]

Accordingly, Cutter proceeded, following the rule for "Societies," to devote special attention to the question of entry of the names of "Societies." There he considered six "plans," of which the "5th Plan" was the most complex, but also the one he favored "well aware that there are strong objections" to it "but believing that Plan 5 is on the whole the best." The aim of this plan was to have "local societies" entered in the catalog under the place of location, but "societies not local" under their names; American and English "academies" under their names, but those "of the European Continent and of South America" under place; "municipal colleges, libraries,

galleries" under place, but those not municipal under their names; "public schools" under place, but "private schools" under their names; "business firms and corporations" under their names, but "municipal corporations" under place; "London guilds" under "the name of trade," but "American state historical societies" under the name of the state.[55] Since these categories did not include all kinds of corporate bodies, and since not all corporate bodies of any given category could satisfactorily be treated alike because of the difference of character of their names, the 5th Plan was bound to grow in size and complexity, and its capacity for growth became increasingly evident in each of the successive editions of Cutter's rules. By 1949 the question of entry of a corporate name assumed overshadowing proportions in the cataloging rules, where a given corporate body could be entered directly under its name, or under its place of location, or under the jurisdiction supporting it, or under the name of another corporate body--all depending on such considerations as whether it was a "government agency," "society," "institution," or "miscellaneous body"; whether it was a public or private body; whether it was located in the United States, the "British Empire," or elsewhere; whether the name of the corporate body included the name of a geographical area or of a political jurisdiction; whether the name of the corporate body began with a proper noun or proper adjective, and all this in the name of the "convenience of the public" which originally led Cutter to the adoption of the "5th Plan." It was now abundantly clear that Cutter's "5th Plan" was a quicksand from which Anglo-American cataloging had to be extricated, and this became one of the significant achievements of the revision. The principle of direct entry under the name of the corporate body, adopted in the revision and subsequently confirmed by the International Conference on Cataloging Principles, was in fact a return to Jewett's practice after nearly a century's experimentation with Cutter's "5th Plan."

It should be noted that the American edition of the new Anglo-American rules includes "Exceptions for Entry under Place."[56] A footnote to the exceptions explains that they were "required primarily" to avoid very costly adaptations in many American research libraries. Inasmuch, however, as the new rules are generally being applied to the works of new authors only, there has never been a basis for this putative reason, and no reason for the anachronistic and confusing exceptions; and the British have thus well chosen in not going along with these exceptions.

d. Entry of subordinate and related body. One of the factors which complicate materially the cataloging of works of corporate authorship is the fact that a corporate body is not always a discrete entity, but may be subordinate or related to another body. When this is the case, a complex question arises. On the one hand, it would seem that a subordinate body should be entered in the catalog under the name of the parent body, both to indicate its relation to that body and also so that its works will appear in the catalog immediately after those of the body as a whole--thus bringing together the works of a corporate body and of its individual divisions in accordance with the second objective of the catalog. On the other hand, the practical difficulties would make this an impossible task: first, because it would be very difficult and costly in most cases to determine whether a given body is actually subordinate, administratively or functionally, to another body, or merely related to it; second, because the relation of a given body to another is frequently open to change, so that one that is subordinate today may be separated and become an independent body tomorrow, and vice versa; and third, even if it remains subordinate, it may not remain subordinate to the same body, or to the same division or department within the body, because of reorganizations to which corporate bodies are subject--as may be observed in the agencies of government, the divisions and sections

of the American Library Association, and the departments and divisions of the Library of Congress. In view of these circumstances, the most practical course indicated is to treat any entity, or division or unit of a body, as an independent body and enter it under its own name--whenever possible. There are two conditions which militate against it. One is when the name of the subordinate body includes a term like "division," "department," "section," "unit," "chapter," and so on, which implies that it is part of another body; the other is when the subordinate body does not have a complete and self-sufficient name by which it can be identified and requires the name of its parent body for identification--as "Membership Committee," "Personnel Office," "English Language Section," "Council." In these cases the subordinate body should be treated as such and entered under the name of the body followed by its own name--as "Organization of American States. Council." The second condition may be found not only in subordinate but also in related bodies, which must therefore similarly be treated--as "Yale University. Society of Alumni."

Because of the organizational impermanence of a corporate body and the possibilities of relocation within it, an entity which is to be treated as a subordinate body should be entered directly under that entity above it which is entered under its own name, and not under that which is immediately above it, but which is itself treated as a subordinate body--except when this would create an ambiguity, as when the larger entity includes more than one subordinate entity of the same name or similar names. Thus, for example, the Cataloging and Classification Section should be entered directly under the American Library Association, and not under the Resources and Technical Services Division of which it is a part but which is itself treated as a subordinate body; but the Membership Committee of the Resources and Technical Services Division could not be entered directly under the American Library Association because it would then be misconstrued as the Membership Committee of the American Library Association.

References

In the following notes the following abbreviations are used:

AACR (Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. North American Text. Chicago, American Library Association, 1967).

ALA (American Library Association. A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries. Second Edition, Chicago, 1949).

CCR (Lubetzky, Seymour. Code of Cataloging Rules: Author and Title Entry. An unfinished draft . . . [Chicago, American Library Association] 1960).

CR (Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries. American Edition. Chicago, American Library Association, 1908).

Cutter (Cutter, Charles A. Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalog. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1876).

ICCP (International Conference on Cataloging Principles, Paris, 1961. Report. London, 1963).

Jewett (Jewett, Charles C. On the Construction of Catalogues of Libraries, and of a General Catalogue . . . with Rules and Examples. Washington, Smithsonian Institution, 1852).

Panizzi (Panizzi's Rules for the compilation of the British Museum Catalogue, in: British Museum. Catalogue of Printed Books in the British Museum. Volume I. London, 1841. p. [v]-ix. Letter A only; no more published).

1. Panizzi
2. Cutter, [First]-Fourth Edition, 1876-1904.
3. CR
4. American Library Association. A.L.A. Catalog Rules, Author and Title Entries. Preliminary American Second Edition. Chicago, 1941.
5. Osborn, Andrew, D. "The Crisis in Cataloging," Library Quarterly 11:393-411 (October 1941).
6. U.S. Library of Congress. Processing Department. Studies of Descriptive Cataloging. Washington, 1946.
7. Lubetzky, Seymour. Cataloging Rules and Principles. Washington, Processing Department, Library of Congress, 1953.
8. AACR
9. CCR, "Objectives," p. ix.
10. ICCP, "Functions of the Catalogue," p. 25 and 91-92.
11. Ibid., p. 139-163.
12. CR, p. [xiii].
13. ALA, p. 3.
14. AACR, "Glossary," p. 343.
15. Hanson, J.C.M. "Corporate Authorship Versus Title Entry," Library Quarterly 5:458-9 (October 1935).
16. AACR, rule 220, p. 282.
17. Ibid., rule 221, p. 283.
18. Sowerby, E. Millicent. Catalogue of the Library of Thomas Jefferson. Washington, The Library of Congress, 1952-1959. Volume 1, p. 67 and 220.
19. ICCP, "Collections," p. 66-68.
20. ALA, rules 5D-E, p. 14-15.

21. CCR, rule 5, p. 7.

22. AACR, p. 17-18.

23. ALA, rule 5C(1), p. 11 (Exception is not explicit, but implicit).

24. AACR, rule 6B, p. 20-22.

25. Ibid., "General Character," p. 4-5.

26. Ibid., rule 1, p. 11.

27. ALA, rule 31, p. 54-56.

28. AACR, rule 2, p. 12-13.

29. ALA, rule 20, p. 43, and rule 22, p. 44-45.

30. Ibid., rule 36, p. 82.

31. Quoted in Cutter, p. 22.

32. AACR, rule 43C, p. 76.

33. ICCP, "Entry Word for Personal Names," p. 81-86 and 96.

34. AACR, rule 46E1, p. 84.

35. Cf. Lubetzky, Seymour. "Titles: Fifth Column of the Catalog," Library Quarterly 11:412-30 (October 1941).

36. Panizzi, rule LXXIX, p. viii.

37. Ibid., rule L11, p. vii.

38. Cf. U.S. Library of Congress. A Catalog of Books Represented by Library of Congress Printed Cards, issued to July 31, 1942. Ann Arbor, Edwards Brothers, 1942-1946. V. 44, p. 538 and 546-7.

39. Studies of Descriptive Cataloging, op. cit. (note 6) "Appendix D," p. 36-39.

40. Jewett, rule XXI, p. 42.

41. Cutter, rule 26, p. 24.

42. Ibid., rule 39, p. 26.

43. CR, p. xiv.

44. Ibid., rule 107, p. 32.

45. ALA, rule 141, p. 207.

46. Ibid., rule 7, p. 17ff., and rule 16, p. 38.

47. AACR, p. 344; also footnote 4, p. 11.

48. Jewett, rule XXI, p. 42.

49. CR, p. xiv.

50. ALA, rule 71, p. 126.

51. CCR, rule 22, p. 36.

52. AACR, rule 17A1, p. 34.

53. Ibid., rule 17A2, p. 35.

54. Cutter, rule 26, p. 24.

55. Ibid., p. 26-27.

56. AACR, rules 98-99, p. 141-144.